## **PUBLIC SUBMISSION**

**As of:** September 28, 2015 **Received:** September 24, 2015

**Status:** Pending\_Post

**Tracking No.** 1jz-8lba-rq0y

Comments Due: September 24, 2015

**Submission Type:** Web

**Docket:** EBSA-2010-0050

Definition of the Term "Fiduciary"; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice; Notice of proposed rulemaking and withdrawal of previous proposed rule.

Comment On: EBSA-2010-0050-0204

Definition of the Term Fiduciary; Conflict of Interest Rule- Retirement Investment Advice

**Document:** EBSA-2010-0050-DRAFT-7947

Comment on FR Doc # 2015-08831

## **Submitter Information**

Name: David Clark

**Address:** 

2329 Eagleview Circle Longmont, 80504 **Email:** drclark84@msn.com

**Phone:** 3035816296

## **General Comment**

Dear Sir/Ma'am,

I am writing to say that I am opposed to your EBSA Proposed Rule, to the extent the "Best Interest Contract Exemption"

provision could result in preventing retirement savers from exercising options to limit risk. The wording is not clear, but if

trading options is excluded the list of assets for which a fiduciary may receive compensation, then discount brokerages

servicing IRAs would no longer receive compensation (fees) for executing such trades. I am opposed to this. Of course

options, like any investment, can result in losses. But properly structured, options can limit downside risk for the informed investor.